

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5 are currently being considered, and Claim 1 is the sole independent claim currently being considered. Claims 6-23 are withdrawn from consideration. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Jahnke in view of Spencer

1. In the Office Action on pages 2-3, claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being rendered obvious by Jahnke et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062408) (hereinafter Jahnke) in view of Spencer (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0243739) (hereinafter Spencer). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including a direct memory access register adapted to hold a descriptor. The register includes a command register, a source address register, a target address register, and a descriptor address register. The command register has a compare enable bit and a branch enable bit.

Jahnke, at a minimum, fails to teach or fairly suggest the recited command register with a branch enable bit, in contrast to the assertion by the Office Action. For support of its assertion, the Office Action aligns the recited command register with a branch enable bit with branches 408 and 409 emanating from decision block 407 in Figure 4 and to paragraphs [0047]-[0048] of Jahnke. The decision block 407 of Jahnke determines whether the CNTVAL counter 333 has reached hexadecimal zero (i.e., 0x0000). The CNTVAL counter 333 is decreased by one every time a word is transferred from the write data register to the current target address location. If

the CNTVL counter 333 has not yet reached hexadecimal zero (i.e., 0x0000), branch 408 is taken, and another word is transferred. If the CNTVL counter 333 has reached hexadecimal zero (i.e., 0x0000), branch 409 is taken, and the transfer is complete. Jahnke, paragraphs [0037], [0046]-[0047].

Jahnke fails to use a command register with a branch enable bit, and instead uses the CNTVAL counter 333 having hexadecimal values to determine if a branch is to occur. The CNTVAL counter 333, however, is **not** a register. Jahnke teaches registers, such as registers 321 to 328, and the CNTVAL counter 333 is not a register. Instead, the value from the register 327 is loaded into the CNTVAL counter 333. Jahnke, paragraphs [0027]-[0028]. Further, the CNTVAL counter 333 must be decreased in increments of one to hexadecimal zero (i.e., 0x0000) for the branch to be enabled. As the Examiner may recall, a hexadecimal number is a number that uses 16 instead of 10 as its base for representing digits. A hexadecimal number uses the digits 0 through 9 and the letters A through F to represent the decimal numbers 0 to 15. Further, one hexadecimal number is equivalent to 4 bits. Here, the CNTVAL counter 333 uses 6 hexadecimal digits, which corresponds to 24 bits (= 6 hexadecimal digits × 4 bits/hexadecimal digit). Hence, Jahnke uses **a counter** that must be **decreased by one** and **checked each cycle**, which is not a **register**, where the counter that uses 24 bits, which is not a **single** bit.

Thus, Jahnke fails to teach or fairly suggest the recited command register with a branch enable bit. Further, Spencer fails to overcome the failings of Jahnke. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Jahnke in view of Spencer.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1 and is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Jahnke

1. In the Office Action on pages 3-4, claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being rendered obvious by Jahnke. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

First, the Office Action fails to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness. Claims 3-5 variously depend from claim 1 and, by statute, include the limitations of claim 1. See 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph. The Office Action rejected claim 1 as being rendered obvious by Jahnke in view of Spencer. In rejecting claims 3-5, the Office Action only relies on Jahnke and fails to state how the limitations of claim 1, as included in the limitations of claims 3-5, are rendered obvious by Jahnke alone. Thus, the Office Action fails to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness for rejecting claims 3-5.

Second, claims 3-5 are variously dependent from claim 1 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

3. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to

kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Date: June 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D.

Registration No. 41,289

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

Telephone: (202) 344-4000

Telefax: (202) 344-8300

Attorney for Applicant

DC2-757955